

REMARKS

Claims 38-92 are pending. Claims 38, 58, 70, 74, 79, 85 and 89 are independent claims.

Claims 38-92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,499,026 B1 to Rivette et al. ("Rivette"). The applicant has amended claims 38, 58, 70, 74, 79, 85 and 89, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the claim rejections in view of the amendment and the remarks.

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claim 38 stands rejected as being anticipated by Rivette. The applicant traverses the rejection because Rivette fails to disclose or suggest limitations of claim 38. To expedite prosecution, however, the applicant has amended claim 38, which now recites a step of "generating a description of an application, the application being a content authoring application program, that produced the document, and including the generated description of the application in the first document description file."

The applicant respectfully submits that Rivette, including its text at column 93, lines 45-67, fails to teach the above-cited limitation of claim 38. Rivette relates to a system that performs patent-centric and group oriented processing of data. The referenced portion of Rivette describes a client analysis module and a patent aging module, which are components of Rivette's system. The client analysis module receives and displays patent citation information, which specifies the patents that cite a patent of interest. The patent aging module identifies and analyzes remaining terms of patents of interest. None of these modules, however, can constitute a content authoring application program, which is required to anticipate claim 38, and examples of which include word processing and spreadsheet applications. Moreover, even assuming that the modules can constitute content authoring applications, a point the applicant does not concede, there is no mention in the portion at issue that a description of these modules are generated and included in a document description file, which action is also required to anticipate claim 38.

Claim 38 further recites a step of “generating a description of a location from which the document can be obtained, and including the generated description of the location in the first document description file.” The applicant respectfully submits that Rivette, including its FIG. 156 and corresponding text, also fails to teach this step of claim 38. FIG. 156 illustrates a group links tab. A group is a collection of patents that have some common subject of interest. A group link represents a relationship one group can have with another group. The links in FIG. 156 indicate that the groups “Oscar Project” and “Only Luke Can See!” each has a child group called “November Project.” Rivette, at col. 117, lines 30-40. None of these links indicate, however, where documents representing the patents of the group can be obtained. Hence, they cannot constitute descriptions of locations where the documents can be obtained. Moreover, even assuming that the links can constitute such descriptions, a point the applicant does not concede, there is no mention in the portion at issue of including the links in the same document description file that includes the above-discussed generated description of the application, which action is required to anticipate claim 38.

Claim 38 further recites a step of “generating a description specifying a computer-program-implemented operation that can be performed on the document, and including the generated description specifying the computer-program-implemented operation in the first document description file.” The applicant respectfully submits that Rivette, including its text at column 11, lines 30-47, also fails to teach this step of claim 38. The referenced text discloses that although the invention is described with respect to patents, it can be applied to all types of documents, and that the operations described in Rivette can be applied to all types of documents. The referenced text also provides examples of the types of information that the invention can process. There is, however, no teaching of generating a description specifying a computer-program-implemented operation that can be performed on a first document, which action is required to anticipate claim 38. Moreover, there is no teaching of including such a description in the same document description file that includes (i) the above-discussed generated description of the application that produced the document and (ii) the above-discussed generated

description of a location from which the document can be obtained, which action is also required to anticipate claim 38

For at least the above reasons, claim 38 and claims 39-57, which depend from claim 38, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 58 stands rejected as being anticipated by Rivette. The Examiner appears to construe claim 58 to have the same scope as claim 38. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, the applicant has amended claim 58, which now recites a “first document description file comprising: a description of an application, the application being a content authoring application program, that produced the first document; a description of a location from which the first document can be obtained; a description specifying a computer-program-implemented operation that can be performed on the first document” These limitations are similar to the ones discussed above with respect to claim 38. For at least reasons similar to those discussed above, Rivette fails to teach the document description file of claim 58. Accordingly, claim 58 and claims 59-69, which depend from claim 58, are in condition for allowance.

Claims 70, 74, 79, 85, and 89 stand rejected as being anticipated by Rivette. The applicant traverses the rejections because Rivette does not disclose or suggest elements of these claims. To expedite prosecution, however, the applicant has amended the claims. Each of them now recites limitations similar to the ones discussed above in reference to claim 38, and the arguments presented for claim 38 apply to each of these claim with equal force. For at least this reason, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 70, 74, 79, 85, and 89, and their respective dependent claims, are in condition for allowance.

Applicant : T.V. Raman and P.A. Caro
Serial No. : 09/582,355
Filed : June 21, 2000
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-304001 / P280

The applicant requests that all pending claims be allowed. No fee is believed to be due with the instant reply. If, however, there are charges or credits, please apply them to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 15, 2004



Tim H. Pham
Reg. No. 48,589

Customer No.: 021876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50232590.doc